

*R. J. T. e. f. 1650* 3. F. & C.

K

T H E -

# QUIP MODEST;

A

F E W W O R D S

2

BY WAY OF

## S U P P L E M E N T

T O

R E M A R K S,

*CRITICAL AND ILLUSTRATIVE,*

ON THE

*TEXT and NOTES of the LAST EDITION*

OF

*S H A K S P E A R E;*

OCCASIONED BY A

REPUBLICATION OF THAT EDITION,

REVISED AND AUGMENTED BY THE  
EDITOR OF DODSLEY'S OLD PLAYS.

*WE'LL SIFT THIS MATTER FURTHER.*

*ALL'S WELL THAT ENDS WELL.*

---

L O N D O N:

PRINTED FOR J. JOHNSON IN ST. PAULS CHURCH YARD.

M DCC LXXXVIII.



## P R E F A C E.

IN the beginning of 1783 I published a book or pamphlet, intitled, "Remarks, critical and illustrative, on the Text and Notes of the last Edition of Shakspeare," which, I understand, has been represented as the most incorrect publication that ever appeared; and, indeed, from the list of *errata* in the book itself, and the additional one given at the end of this Preface, the charge does not seem to be without foundation. There is, however, one work which, I believe, may vye with mine in point of inaccuracy, and that is the revised edition of Johnson and Steevenses Shakspeare, which has since made its immaculate appearance, without the notification of a single error \*. I am, nevertheless, far from meaning

\* A complete table of *errata* would be too arduous a task, perhaps, for an individual; the booksellers may therefor think themselves obliged to any person that will contribute to it. I accordingly offer my mite, in the following brief but decent specimen of the accuracy of this famous edition.

V. I. p. 21. *boltspirit* for *bowspirit*.

48. *Ale-wrights* for *ale-knights*.

70. *Trinculo* for *Stephano*.

72. *never* (to spoil the metre) for *ne'er*.

347 & *passim*. *Manhood* for *Manwood*. In another place Sir Hugh Spelman.

Vol. II. p. 39. *distant* for *instant*.

*Ignomy* for *Ignominy*.

68. *conſtruction* for *contraction*.

71. *ſome* for *same*.

Vol. III.

meaning to reproach the learned gentleman who appears to have had the care of that edition, with the negligence of his printers; nor do I think myself at all more culpable on account of the blunders of mine. Every person who has the entire revision of his own press-work will be soon convinced, that nothing is so truly incorrigible as *a virgin proof sheet in its primitive state of unamendment*. There is, however, some little difference in printers; else mercy on the poor author!

Another charge which has been brought against me, is no less than downright *felony*. It seems that some of my happiest emendations had already appeared in the margin of the very edition I had presumed to criticise; and the candour of the Critical Reviewers led them to conclude that I must have stole them ready made. Those venerable personages, who have the disinterestedness to devote six days

Vol. III. p. 295. You *shall* not have mocked me before, for you  
should not, &c.

378. *Hear for Here.*

466. *Platony* the son of *Lagus.*

496. *a cuckold's horn.*

Vol. IV. p. 94. *promise-maker* for *promise-breaker.*

118. *Intergatories* for *Interrogatories.*

164. *man for name.*

211. *Fie away* for *fly away.*

264. *danger* for *dagger.*

331. *curse him* for *nurse him.*

347. *Verstigans Institution* for *Verstègans Restitution.*

430. *That rareft* for *The rarest.*

Vol. V. p. 113. *How* for *now.*

161. *Banisb'ft* for *Banisb'd.*

Vol. VI. p. 23. A line omitted :

Else would I have a fling at Winchester.

Vol. VII. p. 371. *If do* for *If I do.*

VIII. p. 190. *to draw*, for *do draw.*

IX. p. 26. *like* for *lye.*

80. *ftore* for *foure.*

109. The *lees* and *diegs* of a flat piece. *Tamed*  
omitted.

X. p. 331. *Heywood* for *Hayward.*

&c. &c. &c. &c.

in seven \* to the service of the public, in passing sentence upon books which they never read, and on the character of writers whom they do not know, could not for their souls comprehend that two persons might happen to hit upon the same idea, or that one, having possessed himself of the idea of another, might, from a defective memory, or any other cause, come in time to imagine it his own. All that I can say upon this head, though I shall not expect credit for my assertion from the good-natured gentlemen I have just mentioned, is, that at the time of the publication of the book, I was not aware of being anticipated in more than a single instance, and even that one I thought my own.

Incorrect, however, and felonious as these same Remarks might be, I found that the revised Edition I have mentioned had got near 200 of them in its margin, all of which were received without opposition; not to speak of the alterations or corrections which I had a right to presume myself the occasion of. There are a few indeed which have not passed muster, but, on the contrary, are treated with such an air of peevishness, that I esteem myself a very unnatural father of so hopeful an offspring, in not having come forward in their vindication sooner. It will be thought, perhaps, by some, altogether unreasonable, that, after the editor of the revised edition has adopted so considerable a majority of my remarks, I should be disposed to find fault with him for his cavalier treatment of a few. I can only say, that it was not to me of the smallest consequence whether he condescended to honour my publication with his notice or not; but I think it my duty to defend every part of it from injury and misrepresentation. I know of no difference between the integrity or character of a writer and that of any other individual; nor ought an unjust charge against the former to remain unrefuted, any more than one against the latter.

\* I conclude, that on *Sunday* the worthy critics "rest from their labours," and go to *Meeting*. They are very good Christians.

This

This defence, I allow, is rather of the latest in making its appearance, and my liberal and candid friends above mentioned will scarcely neglect the opportunity of paying my prudence a compliment, in having attended so well to Horace's rule. The fact is, that my notes were taken in turning over the revised edition immediately after its publication, but have till very lately been laid aside, and, in short, almost forgotten; and perhaps I only anticipate a pleasant observation of my small friends, so oft alluded to, in adding, that it would have proved no great loss if they had been altogether so.

I must not pretend to be ignorant that I have been accused of treating the most eminent Editors, Commentators, and Critics, with too little ceremony; and, indeed,

I fear I've wrong'd the honorable men  
Whose goose-quills have stabb'd Shakspeare.

"If it be so," it is unquestionably "a grievous fault." But I can with great truth and justice urge in my defence, that

I have no personal cause to spurn at them,  
But for the general.

And that

How far I have proceeded in this matter,  
Or how far further shall, is warranted  
By the example of preceding critics,  
Yea, the whole critic tribe.

Before I conclude, I beg leave to assure the respectable gentleman who had the care of the revised edition, that so far from meaning to treat him with the slightest degree of levity or freedom, I do not consider him as responsible for any one of the notes which are the principal objects of the present pamphlet: I conclude them to have been furnished by some obliging friend, who has desired to be effectually

ly concealed under the sanction of the Editors signature \*. If I could possibly think this were not the case, I am under too many obligations to that gentleman, in the course of my different literary pursuits, not to have kissed the rod in silence. However, I doubt not there are many things in the following pages which I might have been allowed to say, without running any possible risk of giving offence to him ; alive as an editor is on such occasions said to feel himself.

At the end of the *Remarks, &c.* I inserted an advertisement of "an edition of the plays of Shakspeare," as then "preparing for the press;" and some enquiries have been made when it would appear. In truth, the attention requisite to the publication of so voluminous a work, and the little likelihood there is of its being productive to the undertaker of any thing but trouble and expence, together with other causes of less consequence, have hitherto deterred me from putting it to the press. But I have neither laid aside all thoughts of bringing it forward, nor can I pledge myself to produce it in any given time. I have little reason to suppose that the Public interests itself at all in the matter, and therefor think myself at full liberty to suit my own inclination and convenience.

1st February 1788.

J. R.

\* This worthy gentleman is probably the infamous scoundrel who published "An Address to the curious in ancient poetry," as, however little relation it may have to Shakspeare, the author has had interest enough to procure it a place in the "List of Detached Pieces of Criticism, &c." prefixed to the revised edition. A congeniality of disposition in the Critical Reviewers procured this fellow a different reception from those literary hangmen, from that which he may one day experience from a well known practical professor of the same mystery.

## ERRATA in the REMARKS, &c.

### Discovered after Publication.

- P. 12. after l. 5. add p. 228.  
P. 20. l. 8. for p. 6. r. p. 64.  
P. 25. after l. 8. add COMEDY OF ERRORS.  
    l. 21. for referred r. restored.  
P. 26. l. 6. dele this line.  
P. 28. l. 9. dele it.  
P. 29. after l. 23. v. MUCH ADO ABOUT NOTHING;  
    and dele those words in the next page.  
P. 33. . 17. for Mr. Steevenses r. Dr. Warburtons.  
P. 86. l. 14. for chidleſſ r. childleſſ.  
P. 94. l. ult. (n.) for strange r. kind of.  
P. 98. l. 14. for absurdity r. necessity.  
P. 123. l. 9. for certainly ſo r. certainly done ſo.  
P. 124. l. penult. for conſtituion r. conſtitution.  
P. 157. l. 11. for is cynical r. is as cynical.  
P. 195. l. 1. for quieſcent r. crescent.  
P. 196. l. 9. for Each of these propofals is, r. The ſecond  
    and third of these propofals are.  
P. 222. l. 25. for play r. pay.  
P. 230. before l. 1. Insert,  
    P. 502.

Ia. King Stephen was a worthy peer.

i. e. says Mr. Steevens, a worthy fellow. In this ſense peer,  
fere, and pheere, he adds, are often uſed by the writers of  
our earliest romances.

## SUPPLEMENT to REMARKS, &c.

### TWO GENTLEMEN OF VERONA.

Vol. I. p. 155 \*.

**I**N answer to what I have been pleased to assert in defence of Shakspeare, against the charge of taking a liberty with his words, by stretching them out to suit the purpose of his metre, Mr. Tyrwhitt has observed as follows: "As to this *supposed* canon of the English language, it would be easy to shew that it is quite fanciful and unfounded; and what he calls *the right method of printing the above words*, is such as, I believe, was never adopted before by any mortal in writing them, nor can be followed in the pronunciation of them, without the help of an entirely new system of spelling. But any further discussion of the matter is unnecessary; because the ~~hypothecis~~, though allowed in its utmost extent, will not prove either of the points to which it is applied. It will neither prove that Shakspeare has not taken a liberty in extending certain words, nor, that he has not taken that liberty chiefly with certain words in which *l* or *r* is subjoined to another consonant. The following are all instances of nouns, substantive or adjective, which can receive no support from the supposed canon. That Shakspeare has taken a liberty in extending these words, is evident, from the consideration

REMARKS,  
P. 7.

\* The paging in this pamphlet is generally from the revised edition.

that the same words are more frequently used by his contemporaries, and by himself, without the additional syllable. Why he has taken this liberty with words in which *l* or *r* is subjoined, must be obvious to every one who can pronounce the language.

“ *Country*, trisyllable.

“ *Twelfth Night*, Act I. sc. 2. The like of him.  
Know’st thou this *country*? \*

“ *Remembrance*, quadrisyllable.

“ *Twelfth Night*, Act I. sc. 1. “ And lasting in her sad remembrance.

“ *Angry*, trisyllable.

“ *Timon of Athens*, Act III. sc. 5. But who is man  
that is not *angry*?

“ *Henry*, trisyllable.

“ *Rich.* III. Act II. sc. 3. So stood the state when  
*Henry* the Sixth.

“ *Monstrous*, trisyllable.

“ *Macbeth*, Act IV. sc. 6. Who cannot want the  
thought how *monstrous*.

“ *Assembly*, quadrisyllable.

“ *Much ado about Nothing*, Act V. sc. last. Good mor-  
row to this fair *assembly*.

“ *Douglas*, trisyllable.

“ *I Henry IV.* Act V. sc. 2. Lord *Douglas*, go you  
and tell him so.

“ *England*, trisyllable.

“ *Rich.* II. Act IV. sc. 1. Then Bolingbroke return  
to *England*.

\* As a single instance is sufficient for my purpose, every additional one has been omitted.

“ *Humbler*,

" *Humbler*, trisyllable.

" *I Hen. VI. Act IV. sc. 1.* Methinks his lordship  
should be *humbler*.

" *Nobler*, trisyllable.

" *Coriolanus, Act III. sc. 2.* You do the *nobler*.  
*Cor.* I muse my muther."

The learned and respectable writer of these observations is now unfortunately no more; but his opinions will not on that account have the less influence with the readers of the revised edition of Shakspeare. I am therefore still at liberty to enforce the justice and propriety of my own sentiments, which I trust I shall be found to do with all possible delicacy toward the memory and character of the ingenious gentleman from whom I have the misfortune to differ.

I humbly conceive, that upon more mature consideration Mr. Tyrwhitt would have admitted, that if the method of printing the words in question were once proved to be right, it would be of little consequence whether the discovery had ever been adopted before, or could be followed in pronunciation, without the help of an entire new system of spelling: which in fact is the very object I mean to contend for; or rather for *a system of spelling*, as I am perfectly confident we have none at present, or at least I have never been able to find it. I shall have reason to think myself peculiarly unfortunate if, after my hypothesis is allowed in its utmost extent, it will not prove what it was principally formed to do, viz. that Shakspeare has not taken a liberty in extending certain words to suit the purpose of his metre. But surely, if I prove that he has only written the words in question as they ought to be written, I prove the whole of my position, which of course should cease to be termed or considered an hypothesis. I may safely admit, that the words in question "are more frequently used by his contemporaries, and by himself, without the additional syllable;" but this will only shew, that his contemporaries and himself have more frequently

taken the liberty of shortening those words than in writing them at length. Such a word as *alarm'd*, for instance, is generally, perhaps constantly, used by poets as a dissyllable; and yet, if we found it with its full power, *alarmed*, we should scarcely say that the writer had taken a liberty in lengthening it a syllable. Thus too the word *diamond* is generally spoken as if two syllables; but it is certainly three, and is so properly given by Shakspeare:

Sir, I must have that *diamond* from you.

The words *observation* and *affection* are usually pronounced, the one as consisting of three, the other of four syllables; but each, notwithstanding, is really a syllable longer :

With *observation*, the which he vents.

Yet have I fierce *affections* and think.

But examples of this nature would be endless.

Of the words quoted by Mr. Tyrwhitt, as instances of the liberty taken by Shakspeare, those which I admit to be properly a syllable shorter, certainly obtained the same pronunciation in the age of that author as he has annexed to them. Thus *country*, *monstrous*, *remembrance*, *assembly*, were not only pronounced in Shakespeares time, the two former as *three*, the other as *four* syllables, but *are so still*; and the reason, to borrow Mr. Tyrwhitts own words, “must be obvious to every one who can pronounce the language.”

“Henry was not only usually pronounced (as indeed it is still) but frequently written as a trisyllable, even in prose. Thus in Dr. Huttons Discourse on the Antiquities of Oxford, at the end of Hearnes *Textus Roffensis*,

“King Henery the eights colledge.”\*

That Mr. Tyrwhitt should have treated the words *angry*, *bumbler*, *nobler*, used as trisyllables, among those which could “receive no support from the supposed canon,” must have been owing to the obscure or imperfect manner in which I attempted to explain it, as these are the

\* See, upon this subject, *Wallisi Grammatica*, p. 57.

very

very instances which the canon, if a canon it must be, is purposely made to support, or rather by which it is to be supported. This canon, in short, is nothing but a very short and simple rule of English grammar, which has been repeated over and over: Every word, compounded upon the principles of the English language, always preserves the radical word unchanged. Thus *humbler* and *nobler*, for instance, are composed of the adjectives *umble* and *noble*, and *er*, the sign of the comparative degree; *angry*, of the noun *anger*, and *y*, the Saxon *iz*. In the use of all these as tri-syllables Shakspeare is most correct; and that he is no less so in *England*, which used to be pronounced as three syllables, and is so still indeed with those who do not acquire the pronunciation of their mother-tongue from the book, and speech certainly preceded writing, will be evident from the etymology, which should be more attended to. Let us examine the word.—How is it to be divided? *Eng-land*, or *En-gland*? It will be evident that there is a defect somewhere: but write it as it should be written, *En-gle-land*, and you have the meaning and etymology of the word and the origin of the nation at first sight, from the Saxon *Englalanda*, the land or country of the *Angles*; as in *Scotland*, *Ireland*, *Finland*, *Lapland*, the country of the *Scot*, the *Ire*, the *Fin*, the *Lap*: and yet, in despite of all sense and reason, about half the words in the language are in the same awkward predicament.

I flatter myself I have completely justified this divine author from the charge of racking his words, as the tyrant did his captives. I hope too I have made it appear, that there is something defective and improper in the common methods of spelling, or rather mis-spelling. A learned and ingenious gentleman, who has undertaken a New Dictionary of the language upon an excellent plan, will have it very much in his power to introduce a systematical reform, which, once established, would remain unvaried and invariable as long as the language endured. This Johnson might have had the honour of; but it is evident that he was very little acquainted with the principles and for-

mation

mation of the words he undertook to explain. Every dictionary, to be perfect, should display a system of orthography, by dividing the words upon etymological principles. At first sight, one would think there was very little difficulty in this; and yet I know not that any grammarian or lexicographer has attempted it. Something of this kind has been effected in Italy, France, and Spain, by the different academies there. And however violent the proposed reform may appear, it is certain, that if two or three of the first printers in London were to adopt it, it would cease to be remarkable in half a year: but till this is done, it does not seem worth the while of an individual to render *his self* singular, when he cannot see the least probability of being able to convince the public of the propriety of his conduct; and there seems no necessity for making such a matter as *this* a point of conscience.

P. 194.

REMARKS,  
p. 12.*Hof.* By my *hallidom* I was fast asleep.

That I should fall into an error myself, is perfectly natural; but that I should have led the infallible editors of Shakspeare into one, is strange indeed. I had hastily supposed *hallidom* to be a corruption of *holy dame*, i. e. the Blessed Virgin, as she is generally called. But it is not, being immediately from the Saxon *haligdom*, which, as I take it, means, my sentence at the general resurrection, or, as I hope to be saved \*.

## MERRY WIVES OF WINDSOR.

Vol. I. p. 252.

REMARKS,  
p. 12.*Slen.* Two Edward shovel-boards, that cost me two shillings and two-pence apiece.

\* I see too, they have adopted my explanation of *valanc'd* (Remarks, p. 198.) which, either through ignorance or inattention, I had made to signify *overhung with a canopy or tester like a bed*; whereas it means *furbelored with a fringed curtain*, like that which generally surrounds the said canopy or tester, and also the bed itself, and is to this day called the *valance*.

My

My remark on this passage is considered by my anonymous friend in the following terms. "Dr. Farmers note, and the authority he quotes, might, I think, pass uncensured, unless better proofs could be produced in opposition to them. They have, however, been objected to, and we are positively told, that Master Slenders 'Edward shovel-boards have *undoubtedly* been broad shillings of Edward the Third. I believe the broad shillings of that monarch were never before heard of, as he *undoubtedly* did not coin any shilling whatever.'

Without attempting to palliate the gross blunder I was *undoubtedly* guilty of in the remark alluded to, I may be permitted to observe, that neither "Dr. Farmers note," nor "the authority he quotes," was censured in that remark, unless difference in opinion necessarily imply censure. No one can have either less reason or less inclination to *censure* this respectable scholar and critic than myself: and I am confident that he would never have thought it necessary to defend either his notes or his authorities in such a stile as the above. By whom the English shilling was first coined, is a piece of knowlege from which the possessor can derive so little merit, that I should think my pleasant and gentlemanlike friend in the dark will scarcely dispute my having had opportunities of acquiring it: how I happened to make so ill a use of them is another matter; which I can neither apologise nor account for. And though I do not think the inaccuracy or inattention of one writer is any excuse for that of another, I may be permitted to notice a few similar slips, to prove my offence is not without its parallels.

In vol. iii. p. 474, Boccaccio is said to be the inventor of the story of Patient Grissel, though Petrarch, to whom he had sent it, expressly tells him, that he had read the story in his infancy.

In vol. v. p. 153, the reader is referred to *Matthew Paris*, for the proof of a fact in the time of *Richard the Second*, above a century after the historians death.

In vol. v. p. 266. King Henry IV. is asserted to be himself the last person that ever bore the title of Duke of Lancaster, though his son (afterwards Henry V.) is well known to have born it during the whole of his fathers reign.

In vol. v. p. 396. the *Court of Wards*, which was first erected by Henry VIII. is supposed to exist in the reign of King Henry IV.

In vol. vi. p. 15. King Henry V. is made to address John Holland, Duke of Exeter, who was beheaded in the first year of King Henry IV.

In p. 510 of the same volume, some lines from *Robert of Gloucester* are quoted as *Geoffrey of Monmouths*; "and then, as *Geoffrey of Monmouth* lays."

I say, I only notice these instances, to prove that the margin of Shakspeare is no more infallible than the text of the Remarks; and consequently, that there was no great need, of exultation on the detection of a single mistake.

P. 279.

REMARKS,

p. 14.

*Pist.* Hope is a curtail'd dog in some affairs.

I believe I was not mistaken in asserting that *excavitation* was not, nor could be, in any case, ordained by the *forest laws*. But an expression of Sir Toby Belch—"call me cut"—having induced a suspicion, that curtailing or cutting the tail of either horse or dog, implied some degree of infamy or shame, I was glad to meet with a passage in *Bracton*, which may serve to give us a pretty clear idea of the matter. *Of the punishment of a ravisher*, says this ancient writer, according to the laws of the Romans, Franks, and English, if he were a knight, his HORSE, to his disgrace, shall have the skin cut off the upper lip, and the TAIL OUGHT TO BE CUT OFF CLOSE TO THE BUTTOCK. So a DOG, if he have one with him, GREYHOUND, or other, shall be disgraced in the same manner \*. The injustice and ab-

\* L. 3. t. 3. c. 28.

surdity

f  
1  
s  
t  
n  
t  
f,  
—  
e  
d,  
  
Mr. Tyrwhitt, on reviewing his former note, did not, he says, think so well of the conjecture in the latter part of it as he had done some years before, and therefore wished to withdraw it; but he was not inclined to adopt the idea of the author of the REMARKS, as he saw "no ground for supposing that Isabella had any mask in her hand;" his notion being, "that the phrase, *these black masks*, signifies nothing more than *black masks*; according to an old idiom of our language, by which the demonstrative pronoun is put for the prepositive article," and refers to his *Glossary to Chaucer, This, These*. "Shakspeare," he adds, "seems to have used the same idiom, not only in the passage quoted by Mr. Steevens from *Romeo and Juliet*; but also in *First Henry IV.* Act I. scene 3.

REMARKS,  
p. 20.

— And but for *these* vile guns  
He would himself have been a soldier."

As to the quotation from *Romeo and Juliet*, I had already explained that, by the very construction Mr. Tyrwhitt has approved \*. But I am not so well satisfied of the justness of its application to the passage cited from *First Henry IV.* as, I conceive, Percy is repeating the words of one who spoke with *those* vile guns before his eye.

\* Remarks, p. 275.

Though this learned and ingenious commentator might see no ground for supposing that Isabella held a mask in her hand, it does not follow that the notion is entirely groundless. It was certainly the fashion in Shakspeare's time, and perhaps long after, for ladies to wear masks; and as Isabella is about to take the veil, it may be probable that she could not consistently walk through the streets without a mask, which, on coming into Angelos presence, she would of course hold in her hand.

I am the rather confirmed that this is the true sense of the passage, from the frequency of Shakspeare's allusions to the custom of wearing masks.

Thus, in the *Two Gentlemen of Verona*:

"And threw her sun-expelling *mask* away."

Again, in *Troilus and Cressida*, the latter enumerating her several wards or defences, says, she relies upon her *mask* to defend her beauty.

Again, in *Cymbeline*:

"—— lads ——

With faces fit for *masks*, or rather fairer  
Than those for preservation cas'd or shame."

Again, in *Othello*:

"To fetch her fan, her gloves, her *mask*, nor nothing?"

In *Loves Labour Lost*, the princess and ladies wear *taffata masks*; and Autolycus, in the *Winters Tale*, has "masks for faces and for noses."

I shall say nothing more as to the word *enshield*, than that I still think it to be a contraction for *enshielded*; but I shall be very willing to abate my confidence, when any authority is produced for the usage contended for, of *en-shelld* or *in-shelld*. No word, I conceive, ought to be displaced from the text by one equally objectionable; and every word in the old editions is to be deemed CERTAINLY Shakspeare's, till the contrary appears.

## MIDSUMMER NIGHTS DREAM.

Vol. III. p. 36.

*Ob. The human mortals want their winter here.*REMARKS,  
P. 43.

In reply to the remark on this passage, the gentleman who has assumed the signature of "The Editor," after lamenting the misfortune of the commentators and readers of Shakspeare, in having so much of their time employed in explaining and contradicting unfounded conjectures and assertions, produces an extract from Mr. Wartons *Observations on Spensers Fairy Queen*, to prove, that in Shakspeares time the notion of Fairies dying was generally known; and adds, that Tickells poem, called *Kensington Gardens*, will shew that the opinion prevailed in the present century. A future editor of our author, he says, may, without any detriment to his work, omit this note, which he should have been better pleased to have had no occasion to incumber the page with.

Every person of feeling must surely sympathise with an editor of Shakspeare, who, contrary to the established practice of gentlemen in his situation, instead of the more agreeable employment of making unfounded conjectures and assertions, is reduced to the hard necessity of contradicting them; more especially when, after all his toil and trouble, and writing about it and about it, the point is left pretty much the same as it was found. The real and ostensible editor of the revised edition is a person of too extensive reading, as well as of too much good sense, to quote the fanciful genealogies of Spenser, at second hand, to illustrate a popular superstition, with which, as he well knows, the *Faerie Queene* has not the remotest connection. No one who has read even a single canto of Spensers poem, can be ignorant of the dissimilarity between his Fairies and the Fairies of Shakspeare; or that a system, imagined to serve the purposes of allegory and allusion to real characters, has nothing in common with the vulgar opinion, to which in fact he has not been indebted for a

single idea. Mr. Tickells poem I neither know where to find, nor think it worth my while to enquire after. I have such authority, however, for what the above candid and good-tempered pseudo-editor is pleased to call an unfounded conjecture and assertion, that, far from being disposed to retract an iota of what I have already advanced on the subject, I will venture to maintain the propriety of my opinion in its fullest extent, viz. that the Fairies of Shakespeare and the common people are immortal, and were never esteemed otherwise. And, first, to shew how little Spenser is to be regarded as an authority in the matter, it will be only necessary to have recourse to the doctrine of that poets master, the inimitable Ariosto, who expressly tells us that a Fairy *can not die*:

*Morir non puote alcuna Fata mai,  
Fin che'l Sol gira, ò il ciel non muta filo.*

*Ma le Fate morir sempre non ponno \**.

The character of a Fairy in the old Romances †, like that of the ancient Wood-nymphs, unites the ideas of power and beauty, and such are the Fairies of Ariosto and Spenser; as Shakespeare himself evidently knew, when he made Mark Antony say,

To this great Fairy I'll commend thy acts.

It is to this species of Fairies that Milton alludes, where he speaks of

—Fairy damsels met in forest wide,  
By knights of Logrēs and of Liones,  
Lancelot, or Pelleas, or Pellenore.

The Fairies, on the contrary, of the *Midsummer Nights Dream*, according to a beautiful passage of the same author, are,

—Faerie elves,  
Whose midnight revels, by a forest side,

\* *Orlando Furioso*, c. 10. l. 56.

† See particularly *Histoire de Mélusine*; of which there is a very ancient English translation in the Museum.

Or fountain, some belated peasant sees,  
 Or dreams he sees, while over head the moon  
 Sits arbitress, and neerer to the earth  
 Wheels her pale course; they, on thir mirth and dance  
 Intent, with jocond music charm his ear;  
 At once with joy and fear his heart rebounds.

Beaumont and Fletcher, I should conceive as good a voucher for the popular opinion of Shakspeares time as either Spenser or Tickell. And see what they say in the *Faithful Shepherdess*:

A virtuous well, about whose flow'ry banks  
 The nimble-footed Fairies dance their rounds  
 By the pale moon-shine, dipping oftentimes  
 Their stolen children, so to make 'em free  
 From dying flesh, and dull mortality.

Pretty conclusive evidence this, one should think! There is, indeed, a foolish Romance, intitled *Huon de Bourdeaux*, which had been turned into English long before Shakspeares time, where Oberon, king of the Fairies, is made to dye and bequeath his dominions to Huon. And Mr. Steevens (vol. iii. 135.) mentions his having been informed, that the originals of Oberon and Titania are to be sought in this romance. They may be there sought, indeed, but I know, by woeful experience, they are not there to be found.

Shakspeare, I am convinced, was upon this occasion indebted to no book whatever; unless it were the great book of society, which he perused and studied with so much care. And that he himself has expressly represented his Fairies immortal, will appear from the following quotations, which could only have escaped the notice of a supposititious editor, less attentive to his authors text than tenacious of the mistakes of his predecessors or himself.

I Fairy. [to Bottom.] Hail, mortal, hail!

Puck. Believe me, king of shadows, I mistook.

Ob.

*Ob.* But we are spirits of another sort.

*Puck.* If we shadows have offended.

I have only to add, that the editor might, without any detriment to his work, have omitted the above note; but I cannot think that the *page* has any particular reason to complain of the incumbrance, as it would be no difficult matter to point out several hundreds groaning under an equal burthen.

### MERCHANT OF VENICE.

Vol. III. p. 160.

**REMARKS,** *p. 50.* The editor, or some one under his signature, attempts to support Mr. Steevens by a quotation from an old book, which seems little or nothing to the purpose. The words *use*, *usante*, and *usury*, in the time of Shakspeare, appear to have had one and the same meaning, and to have signified precisely what *interest* does at present. Mr. Steevens, by employing the word *usury* in its present sense, makes the Jew condemn himself. And it may be observed, that Antonio in this play does not censure the practice of taking *excessive interest*, but that of taking interest at all; which has been frequently condemned by others as Jewish and Anti-christian.

### ALL'S WELL THAT ENDS WELL.

Vol. IV. p. 136.

*Lafeu.* (to *Parolles.*) Prithee, allow the wind.

"Allow the wind.] i. e. stand to the *windward* of me.  
**STEEVENS.**"

That to be sure would be allowing the wind with a vengeance! Lafeu means, however, the exact reverse; *i. e.* that Parolles should allow the wind a free passage; or (to keep

keep to the sea term) stand to the *leeward* of him; as Mr. Steevens, if he had not been misled by his friend Johnson's Dictionary, sufficiently fruitful in such like mistakes, might probably have explained it.

## TWELFTH NIGHT.

Vol. IV. p. 163.

How will she love—when liver, brain, and heart,  
These sovereign thrones, are all supply'd and fill'd,  
(Her sweet perfections) with one *self-same* king.

"The original and authentic copy," says Mr. Malone (as he is become fond of calling the *first* folio, since the *second* has been the means of detecting so many of his mistakes) "reads—with one *self* king. *Same*," he says, "was added unnecessarily by the editor of the *second* folio, who in many instances appears to have been equally ignorant of our authors language and metre." Though this charge were as true as it is otherwise; and though the editor of the *second* folio had understood our authors language and metre as imperfectly as the learned gentleman himself appears to do, the present alteration would be no instance of it. But see how this ingenious critic explains the passage! "*Self* king," says he, "is *king o'er HERself*; one who reigns absolute in her bosom." *King o'er herself* may, for any thing I know, be very good *Irish*; but one would think it ought to be *Queen o'er herself*, to make it good *English*. But, this by the way, I should be glad to know if it be possible for any person who has read but two lines of Shakspere, and has but two grains of common sense, to betray stronger symptoms of a very imperfect acquaintance with his sense, language, metre, or any thing else. As to the metre, the additional syllable, though not absolutely necessary, perhaps, is certainly an improvement; the word *perfections* must otherwise have been pronounced as four syllables, which,

which, though not unusual with Shakspeare, is far from being harmonious. As to the sense, that is left pretty much as it was : the compound *self-same* had come into use in Shakspeare's time, instead of the ancient adjective *self* : he uses both frequently ; as Mr. Malone, if he will take the trouble to read him over for the purpose, may for certainty know. And the meaning of the passage, if indeed it be at all necessary to explain what no one perhaps but Mr. Malone can possibly misconceive, is merely and simply this : when these sovereign thrones, are all supplied and fill'd with *one and the same king*, i. e. LOVE.

## M A C B E T H.

Vol. IV. p. 473.

REMARKS,  
P. 71.

*Macb. The prince of Cumberland.*

Mr. Steevens having observed that the crown of Scotland was originally not hereditary ; and that when a successor was declared in the lifetime of the king, the title of *prince of Cumberland* was immediately bestowed on him as the mark of his designation, I took the liberty to question the propriety of this observation ; and to assert, that the crown of Scotland had been hereditary for ages before Duncan—nay, from the very foundation of the Scotch monarchy ; that the *apparent* or *presumptive heir* was always the known and declared successor ; and that the king's *eldest son*, or grandson (i. e. the heir apparent for the time being) alone was *prince of Cumberland*. Mr. Steevens had originally quoted *Hollinshed* ; and Mr. Malone, in the revised edition, supports him, by a quotation from *Bellendens translation of Boetius*, which Hollinshed copied. I have said that it should seem, from the play, that Malcolm was the *first* who had the title of *prince of Cumberland* ; and so it does ; though this was certainly not the case, as Malcolm, son of Donald VI. afterwards Malcolm I. is by the Scotch historians expressly asserted to have born it in the reign of Constantine III.

(anno 903) who appointed that thenceforward the heir apparent to the crown of Scotland for the time being should possess that country, as his appanage. Shakespeares mistake may be easily accounted for.

Mr. Steevens, I see, has added, that “*Cumberland* was at that time held by *Scotland* of the crown or *England* as a fief;” but I fancy he will find that fiefs were at that time, and long after, unknown in either country \*.

## KING JOHN.

Vol. V. p. 72.

I think it proper to acknowledge that Mr. Malone has produced a sufficient number of instances to justify his assertion; that *one* and *on* are perpetually confounded in the old copies, (so far at least, that *on* is frequently misprinted for *one*) which I confess, as I was not hunting after such trifles, had escaped my observation: but what end it has answered, save as an instance of this ingenious gentlemans industry, I am at a total loss to conceive; as I have sufficiently proved that *one*, both in and long before Shakspeares time, had obtained the same pronunciation it does at present.

REMARKS,  
P. 238.

## RICHARD THE SECOND.

P. 191.

*Buck.* My lord of Hereford, my message is to you.

*Bolin.* My lord, my answer is —— to Lancaster.

\* It might be a custom in Denmark, when the blood royal was extinct, to elect a successor; and to this Hamlet may allude when he bequeaths his dying voice to Fortinbras. So in *Amadis de Gæule*, 1618: “Laucine (king of Swetia) dying without heirs, Gasquilan, beeing knowne in many places to bee one of the most gentle knights that the world yeelded, was called by them of Swetia, and elected to bee their king.” B. iv. c. 17. It may be added, that Gasquilan was son of Laucines’ sister; but then it must be presumed that females or their issue were incapable of inheriting the crown of Swetia.

D

This

This significant dash appears to have been adopted on the credit of the critical acumen of Mr. Malone. As the line was before printed, he observes, the sense was obscure ; which, as he, doubtless, means to himself, we may very readily believe. How this same dash was to illumine the passage, we might however have still been at a loss to discover, if the ingenious commentator had not been pleased to explain it for the benefit of more opaque intellects ; which he does as follows : “ Your message, you say, is to my lord of *Hereford*. My answer is——It is not to him ; it is to the duke of *Lancaster*.” Now it is conceived that there was scarcely a single reader of Shakspeare, since he first begun to be read, excepting this ingenious gentleman, who could have hesitated a moment at the line as it originally stood. The sense of it at present, indeed, even though we be *edified by the margin*, seems confined to the *professed critic*.

My lord of *Hereford*, says Berkeley, I have a message for you. My lord, says Bolingbroke, I answer to no name but *Lancaster* ;

And I must find *that title in your tongue*  
Before I make reply to aught you say.

And yet Mr. Malone fancies himself such a proficient in our author, that he has advertised, and, as I understand, is even about to publish his own edition of him ; in which we may expect to meet with a few hundred such proofs of the editors peculiar sagacity.

#### P. 198.

*Boling. Dispark'd my parks and fell'd my forest woods.*

“ To *disspark*,” Mr. Steevens observes, “ is to throw down the hedges of an enclosure—*dissipio* ;” which seems a strange sort of an explanation of a very common word. Every field is an enclosure ; but no one ever heard of the *disparking* of a field. To *disspark* is merely to *unpark* ; to make

make that which was a park a park no more ; and this is done by throwing down the *pales* and laying it open. Mr. Steevens says he met with the word in *Barret's Dictionary*, 1580. It would be difficult, perhaps, to mention a dictionary in which he could not meet with it.

## P. 200.

And when they from thy bosom pluck a flower,  
Guard it, I pray thee, with a lurking adder.

"Guard it," signifies here, as in many other places, *line it.*" MALONE.

Mr. Malone is very industrious in accumulating instances of the use of any particular word ; will he be so good as point out to us, in his edition, one or two of the senses he here imputes to the word *guard*? One does not much regard his opinions or his assertions, but one is always glad to see his proofs. In the mean time, I shall be persuaded that, by *guarding it with a lurking adder*, Shakspeare meant placing an adder in the flower by way of *guard* ; putting a soldier in it.

## P. 227.

REMARKS,  
p. 86.

Fitz. —— my rapiers point.

In answer to the REMARK on this passage, the Editor of the revised edition, or rather his skulking friend, observes, that "it is probable that Dr. Johnson did not see the necessity of citing any authority for a fact so well known, or suspect that any person would demand one. If an authority however only is wanted," he says, "perhaps the following may be deemed sufficient to justify the Doctors observation,— "at that time two other Englishmen, sir W. Stanley and Rowland York, got an ignominious name of traytors. This Yorke, borne in London, was a man most negligent

and lazy, but desperately hardy; he was in his time the most famous of those who respected fencing, having been the first that brought into England that wicked and pernicious fashion to fight in the fields in duels with a rapier called a tucke onely for the thurst. The English having till that very time used to fight with backe swords, slasching and cutting one the other armed with targets or bucklers with very broad weapons, accounting it not to be a manly action to fight by thrusting and stabbing, and chiefly under the waste." *Darcies Annals of Queen Elizabeth*, 4to, 1623, p. 223. sub anno 1587.

" Again, in *Bulleines Dialogue between Soarneffe and Chirurgi*, fol. 1579, p. 20. " There is a new kynd of instruments to let bloud withall, whych brynge the bloud letter some tyme to the gallowes, because hee stryketh to deepe. These instruments are called the ruffins tucke and long foining rapier : weapons more malicious than manly."

That Dr. Johnson did not see the necessity of citing any authority to convict Shakspeare of this anachronism, or suspect that any person would demand one, is as little to the purpose as it is true that the fact is well known. If Dr. Johnson had been possessed of any authority, there can be no doubt that he would have produced it ; but, however confident he may be in his assertions, no one was ever more ignorant of the manners either of Shakspeares age or of the ages preceding it. But ignorant as he was, it would not have been difficult for him to have found authorities, which make as little in his favour as those brought forward in the revised edition. Dr. Johnson has taken upon himself to assert that the Rapier was a weapon not seen in England till 1599, that is, two centuries after the time of which Shakspeare was writing, and two years after the publication of this identical play ; an assertion which the author of the above note, out of his zeal for the credit of Dr. Johnson, has pronounced a notorious *fact*, and produced what he calls a sufficient authority to justify

justify it. This authority, however, proves at most no more than that *a rapier*, called *a tucke* “only for the *thurst*,” had been introduced by a person who was hanged in 1587, and that “*the long foining rapier*” was a new kind of instrument in 1579. The *rapier* NOT called a *tucke*, and for something more than the *thurst* or the *long foin*, might, for any thing that yet appears to the contrary, have been an ordinary weapon long before either Yorke \*, Bulleine, or Shakspeare was born. But supposing it was not, what then? Shakspeare could have made use of the word *rapier* as a general name for a *sword*, the species for the genus; and Dr. Johnson might with equal propriety have objected to Julius Cæsar speaking English.

Shakspeare has so many anachronisms to answer for, that some people seem to think it is no matter how many, real or pretended, they add to the number; which, as his sincere admirer, I am anxious should not be wantonly increased. I will not, indeed, assert, that the *rapier* was actually known in this country under that very name in the time of king Richard the Second; but I shall certainly think it sufficient to prove, that it was familiar to us long before the time at which Shakspeare wrote; and let Dr. Johnsons advocate shew why both the poet and his readers have not a right to presume it was so in the times of which he was writing.

The fact I take to be this: the ancient *rapier* was a long two-edged sharp-pointed weapon, essentially different from that mentioned by Darcy and Bulleine, which was for the *thrust* only, whereas the other was for *both blow and thrust*. In a note to *Much ado about Nothing* (vol. ii. p.

\* It should appear from Carletons *Thankful Remembrance of Gods Mercy*, 1625, as quoted by Mr. Malone in the notes to the *Merry Wives of Windsor* (vol. i. p. 296) that York “was . . . famous . . . for bringing in a new kind of fight—to run the point of a *rapier* into a mans body. This manner of fight he brought first into England, &c.” That is, as I understand it, he did not bring the *rapier* itself into England, but only this new manner of fighting with it.

263.) Mr. Steevens produces an extract from an old manuscript in the Sloane Library, "which seems," he says, "to be the fragment of a register formerly belonging to some of our schools, where the "noble Science of Defence was taught," from the year 1568 to 1583;" in which we find the following entry: "Item a challenge playde before the KING'S MAJESTIE (EDWARD VI.) at Westminster . . at seven kynde of weapons. That is to saye, . . . the RAPIER and TARGET, the *rapier* and *cloke*, &c." And in another place Mr. Steevens, giving an account of this manuscript, expressly tells us that RAPIER and TARGET, *rapier* and *cloke*, *rapier* and *dagger*, were among the weapons used in the fencing school. This I should conceive a sufficient and satisfactory proof, even to the gentleman who has so zealously undertaken to support the random and groundless assertion of Dr. Johnson, that the *rapier* alluded to by Shakspeare was not a *long foining tucke onely for the thrust*; and that he has not given "to the English nobles a weapon which was not seen in England till two centuries afterwards."

Independent of this adventitious assistance, Shakspeare himself has given such a description of the rapier he meant, as could scarcely be overlooked but by an annotator less desirous to illustrate his author than to support the absurdities of an editor. Thus in *Twelfth Night* (vol. iv. p. 254.)

"He is knight dubb'd with *unback'd rapier*:"

i. e. a rapier or sword that has never struck a blow in the field; with a smooth edge: an expression perfectly inapplicable to a small sword, or *long foining rapier, onely for the thrust*. So in *Antony and Cleopatra*:

"To part with *unback'd edges*."

## FIRST PART OF HENRY THE FOURTH.

Vol. V. p. 313.

1 Car. . . . Charles' Wain is over the new chimney.

REMARKS,  
P. 90.

Having professed my obligation to a learned friend for a very ingenious etymology of *Charles's Wain*, I think it proper to mention that the same etymology had been already given by Dr. Hickes, and is to be found in Thoresbys *Ducatus Leodiensis*; so that I have possibly ascribed to my learned friend the merit of a discovery which he was not intitled to, and never meant to claim, and for which of course he would be very little obliged to me.

P. 342.

"That the sweet wine, at present called *sack*, is different from Falstaff's favourite liquor," the editor is "by no means convinced." It would indeed be wonderful enough if he were; as there is nothing more difficult, or rather less possible, than to convince an Editor—when he is in the wrong. He is therefore inclined to believe that the English of our authors time drank *Canary*, the sweetest of wines, with *sugar*. I suppose they eat their *honey* with it too. That the *sack*, however, mentioned and meant by Shakespeare is NOT the *sack* of this day, will be evident to all but the Editor, by a passage in one of the notes to his own edition (vol. iv. p. 174.) where it is said that *Moll Cutpurse*, ("a notorious baggage that used to go in mans apparel") when brought up to do penance at Pauls Cross, where she "wept bitterly and seemed very penitent," was, it was afterwards doubted, maudlin drunk, having been "discovered to have tippel'd of THREE QUARTS OF SACK, before she came to her penance." Let the Editor try if he can drink ONE QUART. Falstaff himself puts the matter out of doubt, where, in his enumeration of the excellencies

REMARKS,  
P. 92.

of his favourite beverage, he expressly calls it *Sherris*. (See 2 Hen. IV. Act iv. scene 3.) Indeed, if it were possible for the Editor to be right in his persuasion, a certain jolly fellow could never have sung :

My friend and I we drank *whole piss-pots*  
Full of SACK up to the brim ;  
I drank to my friend, and he drank his pot,  
So we put about the whim :  
*Nine bottles and a quart we swallow'd down our throat,*  
But hang such puny sips as these,  
*We laid us all along, with our mouths unto the bung,*  
And we tipp'd *whole hogheads* off with ease.

P. 375.

This is the second placee in which Mr. Steevens introduces what I conceive a very erroneous explanation of the word *mould-warp*; and I flatter myself he will not be offended with an attempt to set him right. “The *mould-warp*,” he says, “is the *mole*, so called because it renders the surface of the earth *unlevel* by the hillocks which it raises.” It certainly is not so called from that circumstance. The name arises from, and is expressive of the circumstance of the animals *warping*, or turning, the *mould* over the surface of the ground, which is actually the case.

## KING HENRY THE FIFTH.

Vol. VI. p. 18.

REMARKS, Cant. —— also king Lewis the ninth.  
P. 103.

Shakspeare wrote *tenth* (as the text is now corrected) and I have contended that he was right, and the alteration wrong. I since find that the latter is in some respect right too; and that our old historians (*i. e.* Fabian, Hollinshead, &c.

&c.) are a unit above the French account. I really do not know for what reason this is so, but it runs strongly in my mind that Fabian has somewhere explained it, though I was unable to find the passage a second time.

## P. 31.

*Living hence.]* The REMARK upon this passage being clear and intelligible, and indeed the only construction it is capable of, Mr. Malone, with his usual diffidence, observes that “if *hence* means *here*, any one word, as Dr. Johnson has somewhere observed, may stand for another. It *undoubtedly*,” he adds, “does not signify *here* in the present passage; and, if it did, it would render what follows, nonsense.” And this, it is supposed, the learned gentleman offers as a convincing argument—and so indeed it may be, that he understands the passage neither as it is nor as it should be. Why has not HE attempted to explain it? But, alas, we know by experience that such attempts, however they may increase difficulties, are ill calculated to remove them.

Not to regard the misconceptions of this most erring commentator by too formal notice, it may suffice to entertain the reader with the following specimens of his singular sagacity and acuteness :

## AS YOU LIKE IT.

Vol. iii. p. 331. As friend remembered not.

“Remember'd for remembering. MALONE.”

## MIDSUMMER NIGHTS DREAM.

Vol. iii. p. 116.

“Make periods in the midst of sentences.”

“It should be observed, *periods* in the text is used in the sense of *full stops*. MALONE.”

E

Nothing

Nothing can be more worthy of observation than such a comment.

JULIUS CÆSAR.

Vol. viii. p. 105. — they—come down  
With *fearful bravery*, thinking, by this face,  
To fasten in our thoughts that they have *courage*.

“ *With fearful bravery*—] That is, *with a gallant shew of courage, carrying with it terror and dismay*. *Fearful* is used here, as in many other places, in an active sense—*producing fear—intimidating*. MALONE.”

How the word *fearful* may be used in other places I do not know: but if it have any meaning at all in this place, it is simply *full of fear*; and *fearful bravery* is a shew of courage, hiding a *cowardly heart*. Anthonys language is certainly the essence of *terror and dismay*.

In p. 139 of the same volume, he says that the word *charge* is “ abbreviated in old English MSS. *chāge*.” I think I know enough both of abbreviations and old English MSS. to enable me to pronounce, that such an abbreviation of *charge* is not, nor ever was to be met with in any.

TROILUS AND CRESSIDA.

Vol. ix. p. 38. — like a strutting player, whose conceit  
Lies in his hamstring, and doth think it rich  
To hear the *wooden dialogue* and *sound*  
‘Twixt his stretch’d footing and the *scaffoldage*.

“ The *galleries* of the theatre, in the time of our author, were sometimes termed *the scaffolds*. MALONE.”

Shakspeare alludes to the *clamping* of the *players buskins* upon the *stage*. The wooden meaning of the note, I fear, must be left to its authors own comprehension.

## HENRY THE FIFTH.

Vol. VI. p. 76.

*Flu.* 'Splood !—up to the preaches you rascals ! will you  
not up to the preaches ?

REMARKS,  
P. 108.

*Pif.* Be merciful, GREAT DUKE, to men of mould.

The absurdity of this reading is so evident, and has been so fully exposed in the REMARKS, that no one, editor or commentator, has had the confidence to say a single word in defence of it, except Mr. Malone, whose candour and ingenuity are equally conspicuous.

He quotes a few words from a long note, where it was said that “it is the Duke of Exeter who enters,” and triumphantly adds, that “in the only folio of authority this certainly is not the case;” because forsooth the blundering editors have suffered the name of *Fluellen* to stand before a speech evidently belonging to *Exeter*:

“ Up to the breach, you dogs ! avaunt, you cullions.”

Is this the language of *Fluellen*? Does *Fluellen* ever speak in heroics? Or is it possible that this line, and the pitiful stuff which the editors have so judiciously preferred:—“ 'Splood !—up to the preaches, you rascals ! will you not up to the preaches ?” can belong to one and the same person? Certainly not. But then, he argues, “when the king retired, the duke of Exeter undoubtedly accompanied him:” And suppose he did, what then? Is he never to come upon the stage again?

As to his assertion, that “Duke means no more here than commander;” nothing bad enough can be said of it. Will he have the goodness to produce one single instance from “the language of our author,” in which the title has any such meaning? “Duke Theseus,” every one who has looked into the *Midsummer Nights Dream*, not excepting himself, very well knows, is “Theseus Duke of Athens.” And though Skelton or any other ancient writer may have called

*Hannibal a Duke*, will he venture to say that any writer ever gave such an appellation to an English officer? These are questions indeed, which, though I ask, I do not expect Mr. Malone to answer: but I shall be free enough to add, that while such critics as he is have the liberty to write such notes as this in the margin of Shakspeare, it will be in vain to expect either honour or justice done to the author.

## SECOND PART OF HENRY THE SIXTH.

Vol. VI. p. 371.

REMARKS,  
p. 120.

*K. Henry*. I thank thee: *Well* these words content me much.

In answer to the Remark on this passage (a Remark which I have since learned is not peculiar to myself) Mr. Steevens says it has been observed by two or three commentators, that it is no way extraordinary the king should forget his wifes name, as it appears in no less than three places she forgets it herself, calling herself *Eleanor*. It has been also said, he adds, that if any contraction of the real name is used, it should be *Meg*. And though he allows all this to be very true, yet as an alteration must be made, Theobalds, he says, is just as good and as probable as any other. He has, therefor, retained it, and wishes it could have been done with propriety without a note.

I leave it to every reader to form his own conclusions on this extraordinary note, which I only wonder to find avowed by Mr. Steevens. No unprejudiced person can hesitate for a moment in admitting this conclusion, that as Shakspeare has already inadvertently used *Eleanor* for *Margaret* no less than three times, so he here uses *Nell* for *Meg*. With what reason therefor can it be said, that *Well* is just as good and as probable an alteration as any other: an alteration which Theobald, had he noticed the repeated mistake of *Eleanor* for *Margaret*, would never have proposed? What a pity it is that Mr. Steevens did not first make the discovery himself!

## THIRD PART OF K. HENRY THE SIXTH.

P. 445.

*Gab.* The queen, with all the northern earls and lords,  
Intend here to besiege you in your castle.

REMARKS,  
P. 125\*

In the course of my Remark on this passage, I observed, that Richard was “ scarcely more than (if, indeed, so much as) nine years old ;” I find he was but just turned of eight.

P. 489.

*A chase in the North of England.]* This scenical direction is given instead of that I objected to in the former edition, *a wood in Lancashire*. And yet I have since met with convincing evidence that the king was actually taken in *Lancashire*; but whether Shakspeare knew it, is more than I can tell. The importance of the fact deserves a minute investigation.

REMARKS,  
P. 128.

P. 504.

The ridiculous story of Warwicks embassy and the lady Bona, ought to be banished out of history; and yet Mr. Hume gives it as circumstantially as if he had found it in a record: whereas there is not even a possibility of its having any foundation whatever, as Warwick actually stood sponsor to the princess Elizabeth, king Edwards first child \*. This period of English history is equally interesting

\* Mr. Hume indisputably merits great praise as an elegant and nervous writer; but he has in numerous instances shewn an evident disregard to facts, varying and even inventing circumstances, for the mere purpose, it should seem, of telling his story to greater advantage, or giving a sort of roundness or point to his periods. For this reason his History is in many parts no more to be regarded than a Romance, as he neither does nor was able to quote any authority for what he relates. Among the many instances which might be adduced in support

ing and obscure : but though I have said that the rupture between the king and his political creator is owing to causes which have not reached posterity, I have since found that

port of these assertions, I shall only mention a remarkable anecdote of Colonel Kirk, who is supposed to have debauched a young woman, the sister (but according to others the wife) of one of the Western rebels, under a solemn promise to grant her the life of her brother, as the price of her compliance. In the morning, to gratify her impatience, he insultingly shews her this beloved brother hanging upon a gibbet, which he had secretly ordered to be erected before the window (or as some say upon the sign post) of his inn. The consequence is, that the young woman goes distracted, and the colonel to breakfast. This story Mr. Hume has worked up with all his powers of eloquence and pathos ; and being so very interesting, no doubt is ever entertained of its truth. Although in fact, so far as it regards Kirk or the reign of James the Second or the English history, it is an impudent and barefaced lye. Mr. Hume indeed was not the fabricator of the falsehood ; but his conduct is not the more excusable on that account, since he had nothing to warrant it that could deserve the name of an authority, and a story that does outrage to human nature, ought not to be adopted by a historian without a voucher equal to its incredibility. The origin of the fable was probably owing to the *pious fraud* of the Whig party, to whom Kirk had rendered himself so odious, that they endeavoured to blacken his character with every action superlatively abominable which they could find recorded. Many less important and more probable calumnies remain unnoticed in the libels of the day ; but this story, and some other circumstances mentioned by Mr. Hume, such as his hanging 19 without the least enquiry into the merits of their cause ; ordering a certain number to be executed, while he and his company should drink to the king's health ; crying, when he observed their feet to shake in the agonies of death, that he would give them *music* to their *dancing*, &c. which exceed every thing one can conceive of the extent of human wickedness, were greedily swallowed and are become a part of the History of England. I do not indeed question but that there are many wives and many sisters who would shew the very same degree of affection for their husbands or their brothers ; but the other part of the story is out of nature, and can only be credible of an *incubus* ; as the utmost stretch of infernal malice which religion can teach and bigots credit, could not exceed that which is thus reported of Kirk. The reader will find the original story, related more circumstantially, though not more affectingly, nor perhaps more truly, in *Wanleys Wonders of the little World of Man*, 1678, chap. 29. § 18, beginning "Charles duke of Burgundy, &c."

Warwick

Warwick took occasional umbrage at several of the kings proceedings: As, 1. his marrying the queens sister to the duke of Buckingham; 2. his conferring the office of treasurer (which he had taken from the lord Montjoy) upon lord Rivers; 3. his making a match between the son and heir of the lord Herbert and Mary the queens sister, and another between the young lord Lisle and the daughter of lord Herbert, and creating young Herbert a knight and lord of Dunstar; 4. his making a match between sir Thomas Gray, the queens son, and lady Anne, daughter and heir to the duke of Exeter, and niece to the king, who had been talked of as a wife for the earl of Northumberland, Warwicks brother. But here the annals of William Worcester, to whom we are indebted for this valuable information, are most unfortunately defective. However, it appears from Rymer, that in the beginning of November 1469, no open variance had taken place between the king and Warwick; though the latter had certainly been accused of favouring king Henry, and had secretly displeased the king by the proposed match between his daughter and the duke of Clarence. On the 23d March 1470 he and the duke were in arms and proclaimed rebels.

To the list of battles, in p. 130, and 131. may be added,  
 10. The battle of . . . . (in North Wales) between Jasper earl of Pembroke (for Lancaster) and . . . . brother to William lord Herbert (afterward earl of Pembroke) (for king Edward) in which the former was defeated . . . . 1467.

The day on which the battle of Stamford was fought (for which I have left a blank) was the 12th March.

## JULIUS CÆSAR.

Vol. VIII. p. 46.

*Cal.* And graves have yawn'd, and yielded up their dead.

The Remark on this passage having the signature COLLINS, those sagacious animals the Reviewers discovered

ed

REMARKS  
p. 143.

ed it to be a quotation from the writings of a learned gentleman of that name, with which they seem so very familiar, that it cannot give them much trouble to point out the particular book and page from whence it was taken; and this they will have a favorable opportunity of doing, in the course of the humane treatment my poor literary bantling here has a right to expect from the mercy of incensed butchers. These pious Christians (possibly from their situation in this world being as nigh heaven or hell as a garret or a cellar can make it) seem to consider themselves as the public guardians of Religion, and are extremely apt to take the alarm at every thing in which they are quick-sighted enough to perceive a reflection upon their sacred charge. Poor fellows! one need not wonder at their anxiety, as they have most probably nothing else to lose. In the mean time, every one who had looked over the notes to the last edition of Shakspeare, would immediately see with what view the names of AMNER and COLLINS were adopted in the REMARKS.

## KING LEAR.

Vol. IX. p. 479.

REMARKS,  
p. 169.Edg. *Come o'er the bourn, Beffy, to me.*

I have printed what I at the time hastily took to be the original song; but I believe that no more than the four first lines are authentic, and that the remainder is a puritanical parody; and as such I freely dedicate it To the Critical Reviewers, for the use of any conventicle, Muggletonian or other, which they are accustomed to frequent.



1-  
i-  
ut  
1;  
in  
t-  
ed  
a-  
ret  
as  
to  
k-  
red  
eir  
se.  
the  
ely  
NS

the  
first  
ical  
ical  
ian

